

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 4:10CR595 JCH (DDN)
)	
BRIAN LEWIS HEDRICK,)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendant's oral and written pre-trial motions to suppress Evidence (Doc. Nos. 59, 96, 117), the Government's oral motion for a determination of the admissibility of arguably suppressible evidence (Doc. No. 60), and the written motion of defendant Hedrick to sever the charges against him for a trial separate from co-defendants (Doc. No. 95). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), these matters were referred to United States Magistrate Judge David D. Noce, who filed a Report and Recommendation on March 7, 2011 (Doc. No. 123). Defendant Hedrick submitted his "Objections to the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation" on March 22, 2011 (Doc. No. 126), and the Government filed its "Response to Defendant's Objections to the Report and Recommendation Denying His Motion to Suppress" the same day (Doc. No. 127) .

The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court (1) deny the oral and written motions of defendant Brian Lewis Hedrick to suppress evidence (Doc. Nos. 59, 96, 117), (2) deny, as moot, the motion by the government for determination by the Court of the admissibility of arguably suppressible evidence (Doc. No. 60), and (3) deny, without prejudice, the written motion of defendant Hedrick to sever the charges against him for a trial separate from co-defendants (Doc. No. 95). After de novo review of this matter, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's recommendation.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 123) is **SUSTAINED, ADOPTED, AND INCORPORATED** herein.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the oral and written motions of defendant Brian Lewis Hedrick to suppress evidence (Doc. Nos. 59, 96, 117) are **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the motion by the government for determination by the Court of the admissibility of arguably suppressible evidence (Doc. No. 60) is **DENIED**, as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the written motion of defendant Hedrick to sever the charges against him for a trial separate from co-defendants (Doc. No. 95) is **DENIED**, without prejudice.

Dated this 23rd day of March, 2011.

/s/ Jean C. Hamilton

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE